



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XXIII, 4.

WHOLE No. 92.

---

## I.—THE TALE OF GYGES AND THE KING OF LYDIA.

### II.

We have now to consider the two great motifs of the Herodotean narrative—the folly of Kandaules and the queen's revenge. Did these belong to the popular tale, or did Herodotos find them elsewhere and insert them in the place of other incidents now lost? On this point the testimony of Plato is only negative. Nor does the replacement of the ring help us at all in itself. Undoubtedly the ring belonged to the murder scene. But this does not imply that the queen's revenge was the cause of the murder. No one, it is true, can disabuse himself of the feeling that the ring had something to do with the door episode. We may be sure that, in some form or other, the door episode goes back to the popular story. But this, too, does not presuppose the folly of Kandaules and, with it, the motive for the queen's revenge as elements in the popular legend. In short, we are again driven back to the brief summary of Plato. Nevertheless, before seeking possible testimony in other sources, it is worth noting that certain general considerations tend to suggest that something like the folly of Kandaules and the queen's revenge did exist in the popular story.

1. If Herodotos used the popular story at all—and this seems to be beyond a doubt—it would hardly be worth considering unless it had contained some such incidents as these.

2. Other versions of the story agree that Gyges was obliged to slay or be slain and that it was the queen who put him in this position.

3. The summary given by Plato does not preclude the presence of both elements. In such a brief statement as this, it is, in fact, just these two incidents that were most likely to be omitted. An abstract concerns itself with the result, not the details.

But we shall get more light on this point from the later references to Gyges. We should remind ourselves, however, that now our investigation is attended by growing complication and uncertainty. We may have to reckon with the faint echo of still other versions long since lost, or of antique attempts to reconcile Herodotos and Plato on no better testimony than ours. These two versions were now famous in the literature. Their secondary and reflex influence upon the old popular version itself is, by no means, impossible. An inaccurate and defective memory, also, is not the exclusive possession of our own day. Finally, we may have to deal with mere rhetoricians. This tribe cannot be trusted to preserve a paltry fact at the expense of a moral sentiment or a brilliant antithesis.

The first important passage to be considered is still a fifth version of Gyges' rise to power. This is found in Iustinus, I 7, 14 f., and reads as follows:

Fuere Lydis multi ante Croesum reges variis casibus memorabiles, nullus tamen fortunae Candauli comparandus. Hic uxorem, quam propter formae pulchritudinem deperiebat, praedicare omnibus solebat, non contentus voluptatum suarum tacita conscientia, nisi etiam matrimonii reticenda publicaret, prorsus quasi silentium damnum pulchritudinis esset. Ad postremum, ut adfirmationi suae fidem faceret, nudam sodali suo Gygi ostendit. Quo pacto et amicum in adulterium uxoris sollicitatum hostem sibi fecit et uxorem, veluti tradito alii amore, a se alienavit. Namque brevi tempore caedes Candauli nuptiarum pretium fuit et uxor mariti sanguine dotata regnum viri et se pariter adultero tradidit.

The work of Iustinus, which Schanz<sup>1</sup> is inclined to place in the third century A. D., is a collection of edifying extracts of the most pronounced rhetorical type from the *Historiae Philippicae* of Pompeius Trogus. This was written in the age of Augustus. It is now generally acknowledged that the principal authority of Trogus was Timagenes, a Greek historian of the same period, but slightly earlier. The credit of this discovery belongs to A. von Gutschmid,<sup>2</sup> but his rather sweeping conclusions are

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte der Röm. Literatur*, 2<sup>te</sup> Aufl., München, 1899, par. 330.

<sup>2</sup> *Kleine Schriften*, V 352; V 218.

now more clearly limited and defined.<sup>1</sup> Whether Trogus took this story of Kandaules directly from Timagenes is uncertain.<sup>2</sup> But, at all events, either directly or through Timagenes, it goes back to some Alexandrian source not far from the time of Plato.<sup>3</sup> This is the important point for us and may be considered as fairly proved.

Now, this version of Iustinus + Trogus + X might be merely a development of Herodotos for a special rhetorical purpose, though, when we consider the period of X, his entire dependence on Herodotos may fairly be doubted. Or, as this version comes to us through a line of historians, X, or his ultimate literary source, must be the result of rationalization. If so, the date of X goes to show that the legend used was none other than that which Herodotos and Plato had before them. Or, thirdly, the version of Iustinus may represent a rationalization colored by the reflex influence of Herodotos. Let us examine the passage itself.

The account of Iustinus comes nearer to Herodotos, as Gutschmid<sup>4</sup> observes, than any other version. But, of course, this observation has no definite value for us until we are able to say wherein Herodotos differed from the popular story. Gutschmid also noted that Iustinus' closing words, *regnum viri*, etc., seem to echo the last sentence of Herodotos, *ἔσχε καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὴν βασιλῆην Γύγης*. But who will fail to perceive that this phrase forms an equally fitting and characteristic ending to the popular story?

On the other hand, though this version of Iustinus is not only shrouded in rhetoric, but, to a certain extent, has actually disappeared in it, no one will fail to perceive that it contains elements not found in Herodotos. The differences, as Gutschmid himself observes, are noteworthy. Kandaules talks of his wife to everyone, not to Gyges alone, as in Herodotos. This, to be sure, might be due to carelessness. The story is several degrees removed from its literary source and rhetoric is not concerned with accuracy in details. But a far more important difference

<sup>1</sup> Mommsen, *Hermes*, XVI 619; Wachsmuth, *Rhein. Mus.*, XLVI 477; Einleit. in *das Stud. der alten Gesch.*, Leipzig, 1895, p. 115, f., etc.

<sup>2</sup> See Schanz, l. c., par. 329, and authorities quoted.

<sup>3</sup> Many attempts to identify the ultimate authority of Trogus more definitely have been made (cf. Schanz, l. c., par. 329) but with no great success. But the purposes of this investigation do not require any further examination of this question. For us it is sufficient to call him X.

<sup>4</sup> *Kleine Schriften*, V 53, f.

between Iustinus and Herodotos is suggested by the sentence, *quo pacto*—alienavit and the expression, *brevi post tempore*. Upon considering these with the remainder of the passage, the version which emerges from Iustinus' rhetoric is about as follows:

Kandaules talked of his wife to everybody. This emphasizes more than in Herodotos the folly and bad taste of the king. Finally, to prove his statements, he puts Gyges, his trusted friend, behind the door, as in Herodotos (*nudam*—*ostendit*). As in Herodotos again, the queen saw Gyges, but made no sign, as she understood the situation. Her love for Kandaules is therefore turned to hatred, and she dreams of revenge (*uxorem*—*alienavit*). Hence she yields to Gyges, who had fallen in love with her, and had therefore become the king's enemy (*quo pacto*—*fecit*). Not long after, having gained Gyges, she offered him the throne and herself if he would kill the king. The deed is accomplished and the price paid in full.

It has already been observed that the door episode here is undoubtedly that of Herodotos. It is equally clear, on the other hand, that the love affair is that of the popular story, and that it also occurs in the chronological sequence implied by Plato's summary. It is not found in Herodotos, but we have already discovered that its absence is due to rationalization. We have even followed one trace, perhaps, of the process in his passing comment regarding Gyges' visits to the queen. The replacement of the ring motif brought to light that these visits in the popular story must have referred to the love affair. The version of Iustinus shows that, setting aside the ring motif, which, in this connection, is not yet accounted for, the love affair was, or could be, quite in harmony with the door episode. In Iustinus the love affair was, in fact, the immediate result of it. The visits are, naturally, after the door episode, not before it, as in Herodotos. The interview with Gyges is *brevi post tempore*, i. e., after the love affair was a *fait accompli*, not, as in Herodotos,<sup>1</sup> the very next morning. These two changes in Herodotos would evidently be due to rationalization, with the view of placing the queen, and, especially, Gyges, in a more favorable light, but, at the same time, without disturbing the great dramatic events of the story. For it will be observed that, while Iustinus' version shows that the love affair of the old legend is perfectly compatible with the door episode, it also shows that the love affair is in perfect

<sup>1</sup> ὥς δὲ ἡμέρῃ τάχιστα ἐγγίνεε, etc. The reader will observe with what a trifling alteration Herodotos changed the whole atmosphere of the story.

harmony with the queen's revenge. The motive of her revenge is the same as in Herodotos, it is only her method of executing it that has changed. The love affair, in short, has become a chapter of it. How much the personal appearance of Gyges may have been supposed to influence the queen in her resolve to write this chapter cannot be said. At all events, it helped to square accounts with Kandaules by a method which some of the Italian *novelle*, among other literary authorities, would have us believe is peculiarly feminine. It also committed Gyges to herself and thus paved the way for further designs. It will be observed that the plot so far developed bears an even closer resemblance to the story of Rosamund than the version of Herodotos itself.

The last sentence of Iustinus is a rolling period so full of rhetoric and moral sentiment that the details of the murder have entirely disappeared and the substance of the interview has all but reached the vanishing point. It might appear, at first sight, that when she thought the proper time had come the queen simply appealed to Gyges through the motives of lust and ambition, without any reference to the door episode. The statement of Plato does not help us here. For a moment, therefore, let us consider Iustinus from another point of view.

The version of Iustinus is a highly rhetorical passage, the object of which is not so much to tell the story of Kandaules as to point a moral to be derived from that story. It is also an abridgment. Further, it is the abridgment of a rationalized version which was also clearly influenced by a strong rhetorical bias and, after the well-known methods of ancient rhetoric, presented from that side, a different side from the one presented by Herodotos. The centre of gravity, so to speak, in Iustinus is the folly of Kandaules, for the dire but natural consequences of which, he can blame no one but himself. The best way to bring out this sentiment and point the moral was to aggravate the guilt of Gyges and his accomplice as much as possible, having first emphasized the close and tender relations which had previously existed between them and Kandaules. It is clear that the story of Iustinus has been influenced by this consideration, and that it is due to this cause if his last sentence was meant to imply that the queen simply appealed to baser motives alone.

But as a matter of fact Iustinus' words do not necessarily imply this. They are also a rhetorical abridgment. The story

of Herodotos, evidently very close to Iustinus' original as well as to the popular tale, agrees with Xanthos that Gyges was forced by the queen to slay or be slain. This motif is not precluded by the abridgment of Iustinus any more than it was by the abridgment of Plato. It is perfectly compatible with the plot of Iustinus so far developed. The queen, having first posted her slaves as in Herodotos, may summon Gyges to the interview and tell him—as a last resort—that he must slay or be slain. She may also impart the information, hitherto kept to herself—certainly, in the popular story, Gyges never betrayed the fact—that she saw him ἐξίόντα διὰ τῶν θυρῶν, that she knew who placed him there, that, if he now refuses to comply with her wishes, she shall, let us say, copy Phaidra's method of revenge upon Hippolytos.

There can be little doubt that the murder scene in the model of Iustinus was the same that we find in Herodotos. The special point too that the queen makes of repeating the door scene betrays her state of mind and is a highly dramatic touch that can hardly have been absent from a popular tale which seems to have contained all the preliminary conditions leading up to it. In fact, Plato records that Gyges had the help of the queen in this episode and his statement has every appearance of referring to the account of it given by Herodotos.

We have seen that X, the ultimate literary source of Iustinus could not have been far from the time of Plato. This was the period of all others when we know that the old legend of Gyges was still current, when, in fact, the summary of Plato may have aroused new interest in it. Under such conditions it is not likely that X would have merely attempted to reconstruct Herodotos on the basis of Plato. It is easier and more reasonable to suppose that X was an independent rationalization of the old popular legend, affected, perhaps, by the phraseology of Herodotos. The high probability of this conclusion is further enhanced by the general considerations already mentioned.

If this is true—and I think that it can hardly be doubted—our question is answered, and we can be certain of that which, otherwise, is only highly probable. The old folk-tale used by Plato and Herodotos contained not only the erotic episode which Herodotos suppressed but it also contained the two great motifs of his version; the folly of Kandaules and the queen's revenge.

We now have to consider how the element of marvel was

harmonized with such a plot. The way in which the ring was used in the love affair has already been derived from Herodotos and Iustinus. The utility of it, also, for the slaughter of Kandaules is, of course, obvious. It may also be easily harmonized with the details of that scene preserved by Herodotos and referred to by Plato. What we still have to discover is how it was managed in the door scene. If Gyges possessed a ring of darkness, how was it that the queen saw him? That she did see him is the essential point of this episode in any version. It is not impossible, of course, to suggest a detail which will explain the situation. Plenty of hints for it might be drawn from other folk-tales of a similar nature. Fortunately, however, we are not driven to this solution of the difficulty.

Ptolemaios Chennos<sup>1</sup> who, according to Suidas, belonged to the latter half of the first century A. D., is known chiefly as the author of a *Καινὴ Ἱστορία* in seven<sup>2</sup> books. The abstract of it by Photios<sup>3</sup> shows that he was a mythographer of the semi-novelistic type.

In this work,<sup>4</sup> as reported by Photios, Chennos stated:

"The wife of Kandaules, whose name Herodotos does not mention, was called Nysia.<sup>5</sup> According to report, she was *δίκωρος*,<sup>6</sup> and extremely sharp

<sup>1</sup> See Christ, *Griechische Litteraturgeschichte*, 3d edit., Munich, 1898, p. 762. See, also, Müller's *Geog. Graeci Min.*, II, p. LVII. I regret that the article of Hercher, JJ., *Suppl.* I 269-293, is not available to me.

<sup>2</sup> 'Sechs Bücher' (Christ, l. c.) is an oversight.

<sup>3</sup> Cod. 190.

<sup>4</sup> *Mythographi Graeci*, Westermann, p. 192; Müller FHG, III, 383, note; IV 278.

<sup>5</sup> On these names (Tudo, Nysia, Habro) for the queen of Kandaules, see, especially, Müller, FHG, III 384, note 54, and IV 278.

Tudo (Damaskenos-Xanthos) is the only name deserving any serious consideration. She was a Mysian princess according to Xanthos, and Müller, l. c., therefore, suggests that Nysia is a mistake for Mysia. It is just as likely to be a name manufactured by the authority of Chennos on the basis of Mysia. Elsewhere, Nysia is not vouched for except in a passage which was probably derived directly or indirectly from Chennos himself. This is a poetical note which J. Tzetzes wrote on his own version of the Gyges story, *Chiliades*, I 144. It is found in Cramer's *Anecdota Oxon.*, III 351 (also quoted in Müller's FHG, IV 278);

Ἡ τοῦ Μυρτίλου τούτου δὲ γυνὴ τοῦ καὶ Κανδαύλου,  
Παρὰ Δινείᾳ φέρεται Σαμιακοῖς ἐν λόγοις  
Νυσσία κλῆσιν ἔχονσα πρὸς Τερτύλλαν ὡς γράφει  
Τις Πτολεμαῖος ἅμα τε καὶ Ἡφαιστίων κλῆσιν.



of sight, being in possession of the stone *δρακοντίτης*,<sup>1</sup> and on this account perceived Gyges when he was passing out of the door. Others call her Tудо,

On 'Aineias' and his *Σαμμακοὶ Λόγοι* see Müller, FHG, IV 278 (not mentioned in Pauly-Wissowa). This one reference of Tzetzes is all that we know of him. He may be real, but under the circumstances, the reputation of Tzetzes is such (cf., e. g. Krumbacher, Byzant. Litt. 2d edit., p. 527) that we need not take Aineias and his book too seriously. Neither Tzetzes nor Chennos himself (Hercher, l. c.) is above suspicion when supporting a statement by some remote authority. Bogus references are, in fact, a noticeable characteristic of Ancient Learning in her senility. We find it in the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, in the astonishing work of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, etc.

The Abas, however, cited by Chennos in this passage is mentioned elsewhere. See FHG, IV 278 and Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa, I, p. 19, no. 11.

The names of Klytia and Habro rest on the authority of Chennos alone.

The tale of Plexiroos is clearly an explanation manufactured *ad hoc*, though it is not at all unlikely that Chennos had an earlier authority for it. The intrusion of the mignon into all departments of literature is highly characteristic of the later Alexandrian Age.

As a matter of fact, Herodotos' failure to name the queen of Kandaules, in itself, tends to show that he had the popular story before him. The chances are that she had no name in the popular story. 'The queen,' *ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ βασιλέως*, is usually quite enough for a fairy-tale.

<sup>6</sup> That is, she had a 'double pupil.' On the origin and meaning of this word and its connection with the superstition of the Evil Eye and supernatural keenness of vision see my article 'Pupula Duplex, a comment on Ovid, *Amores*, I 8, 15,' *Studies in honor of Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve*, Baltimore, 1902, pp. 287-300. On p. 291, f., of that article I mentioned Cuvier (Pliny, III, p. 24, Lemaire) and E. Müller (Philol. VII, p. 254, n. 40) as the only two persons who, to my knowledge, had ever expressed any opinion on a pupula duplex. I might have added from the sphere of literature, Théophile Gautier, 'Le Roi Candaule,' *Nouvelles*, Paris, Fasquelle, 1893, p. 376, and Robert Lytton, 'Gyges and Candaules,' *Chronicles and Characters*, London, 1868, vol. I, p. 66. The passage from Gautier is well worth reading as a piece of fine writing on a phenomenon which he did not understand. Lytton says:

She mused a little; and her intricate eyes,  
Orb within orb, grew dark with cruel light.

These lines were evidently suggested by the passage from Chennos. They do not explain *δίκωρος*.

At the time my investigation of the double pupil was published (cf. p. 290, n. 1) the 4th volume of *Mélusine*, containing one of Tuchmann's valuable articles on the Evil Eye was not available to me. Since then, a copy has come into my hands, and, for the benefit of any who may be interested in the subject, I add here a notable reference (l. c., p. 33) to the superstition in modern times which had entirely escaped me.

Ami-Boué, *La Turquie d'Europe*, Paris, 1840, vol. II, p. 123, gives the contents of two Servian folk-songs in which the leading part is played by the double pupil as a sign of the Evil Eye.

some Klytia, but Abas calls her Habro. They say that Herodotos suppressed her name because his favorite Plexiroos, a native of Halikarnasos, fell in love

Tuchmann also notes (l. c., p. 33) Vair, *Trois Livres des Charmes*, Paris, 1583, p. 106 and (l. c., p. 79), Bogue, *Discours des Sorciers*, Paris, 1607, pp. 313-318; *Six Advis en faict de Sorcellerie*, pp. 28-30 and 60. These, however, belong to a class which I had purposely omitted from my investigation because they are nothing but the more or less inaccurate reference to Pliny, VII, 17 not infrequently found in the numberless pseudo-scientific treatises on witchcraft which appeared in the 16th and 17th centuries. Vair, for example, says, (passage quoted by Tuchmann, l. c.); *Finablement (ainsi que dit Didymus) ceux-là charment facilement . . . qui ont deux prunelles en chaque oeil, ou bien l'effigie d'un cheval en l'un d'eux . . .* The passage is practically a translation of Pliny, VII, 17. 'Ainsi que dit Didymus'—the mention of Didymos in this connection is also found in later authorities—is an interesting case of hereditary citation by name only.

The ultimate authority for 'ainsi que dit Didymus' is a fragment of Didymos Chalkenteros, *Symposiaka*, II, regarding Pliny's Thibii (preserved by Steph. Byzant., 314, 6, M.; cf. M. Schmidt, *Fragmenta Didymi Chal.*, Leipzig, 1854, p. 370) which reads; *θανατοὶ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῶν, οἷς ἂν πλησιάζῃ, καὶ τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν εἰς θάλασσαν ῥιπέντα οὐ καταδύνουσιν.*

It is perfectly obvious that Didymos and Pliny had a common source for this statement. This, as we learn from Pliny himself (l. c.) was Phylarchos. It was, therefore, proper that Didymos should be mentioned as a Pliny-commentary at this point, and as a matter of fact, his name was found there earlier than Dalecamp's edition of 1587. The exact source, however, is not given and the fragment itself is not quoted.

Now, it will be observed that the reference to the double pupil which Vair ascribed to Didymos is not found in Didymos at all but in Pliny, of whom Vair says nothing. It would, therefore, appear that some previous authority on the point taken up by Vair had found the name of Didymos in a Pliny-commentary (VII, 17) and without taking the trouble to trace the reference had, innocently or otherwise, concealed the real source of his information by referring it to Didymos. In fact he may have looked upon Didymos as the original source of the passage and therefore referred to him directly as the author of it, without mentioning Pliny. This is a well-known mediaeval habit of citation and not always designed to awe the reader with a show of superior and recondite learning. At all events, it is evident that Vair and several of his successors in the same line of discussion quoted the name of Didymos without looking up the passage in question.

<sup>1</sup> So Westermann. The word is not found in L. and S. (8th ed.). "Draconitis sive Dracontias" according to Pliny XXXVII 158. Compare Solinus, XXX 16, 17; Isidorus, XIV 14, 7; XIV, 5, 15; Tzetzes, *Chiliades*, 7, 656, f. (Philostratos, *Apoll. Tyan.*, III 6). The superstition of dragon-stones, toad-stones, adder-stones, etc., etc., is world-wide and quite too extensive to allow of further mention here.

with an hetaira by the name of Nysia, and failing to win her, hanged himself in despair. For this reason Herodotos avoided mentioning the name of Nysia because it was hateful to him."

The important point for us in this curious passage is the reason why Nysia, as Chennos names her, saw Gyges when he went out of the door. She possessed a "double-pupil" and also a "dragon-stone." These, Chennos observes, gave her supernatural powers of vision. In my article on the double pupil I pointed out that, in his desire to emphasize this gift of Nysia, Chennos has, after the manner of his kind, unnecessarily doubled powers amounting to the same thing. One or the other would have been sufficient. It is very likely, therefore, that one of these gifts is a later addition either by Chennos himself or some predecessor.

It will be noted that no ring of Gyges is mentioned here.<sup>1</sup> Either the double pupil or the dragon-stone, however, gives its possessor a keenness of vision superior not only to objects merely opaque to ordinary mortals but also, be it observed, to any sort of enchantment. This, in itself, suggests that Gyges did have his ring although Chennos does not mention it. But here, again, we are so fortunate as to have the support of a reference—the only one which has survived from antiquity.

About a century after Chennos, Philostratos, while expatiating at length, in his life of Apollonios of Tyana,<sup>2</sup> on the subject of Indian dragons, the method of capturing them, etc., observes that the wonderful stone in their heads (i. e., the *δρακοντίτης* of Chennos) is "invincible even against the ring which, they say, was possessed by Gyges." This is clearly a reference to the version which Chennos or some one in the line of his authority had in mind. In this version Gyges had the ring which he found in the brazen horse. He was placed behind the door by Kandaules (who, doubtless, had no suspicion that he possessed such a ring<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> That, for that reason, Gyges did not possess a ring in this version was the conclusion which evidently prompted the *ἀλληγορία* of Tzetzes and a reconstruction of Gutschmid's, both of which will be considered in another connection.

<sup>2</sup> III 6 (vol. I, p. 88, K.). This reference was overlooked by Gutschmid.

<sup>3</sup> This, of course, may be taken for granted. On page 290 of my article, on the double pupil, I suggested that in the version to which Chennos refers, Gyges was not put behind the door but, without the connivance of Kandaules, was simply relying upon his ring. A further examination of the old tale of Gyges and his ring shows that the statement should be revised. Gyges did rely upon his ring to escape, but he was put behind the door by Kandaules.

When Gyges left the room he naturally supposed that his ring had made it possible for him to escape without detection. But Nysia possessed supernatural powers which enabled her to see him in spite of it.

Here then, at last, we have the famous door-scene in its entirety. Nysia's discovery of Gyges is accomplished by one of the most popular and characteristic devices of folk-lore, even the most primitive. This is the use of the counter-charm.

I think that we may hardly doubt that this detail which we owe to the joint testimony of Chennos and Philostratos goes back to the old story. In fact, one fails to see how the old story, if it contained the door episode at all could get along without this motif. As we have good reason to believe that it did have the door episode the source of Chennos-Philostratos becomes a matter of less importance. A brief statement however will not be out of place as it leads us to other conclusions of some value.

The entire passage of Chennos appears to be nothing more than a series of comments on the version of Herodotos and suggested by other literary sources. We have already seen<sup>1</sup> that some of them may still be identified. This, however, proves no more than the fact that Chennos himself was perhaps, unacquainted with the old story as a whole and therefore attached some reference to it which he found, no one knows where, to the version of Herodotos which was familiar to all. In other words, we should here find a proof that by the end of the first century the old popular legend as such had wholly or partially disappeared. It may very well be that this was actually the case.

That Chennos himself invented his statement regarding the door episode is far from impossible *per se*. Hercher's brilliant investigation<sup>2</sup> showed that Chennos was not averse to this method of citation. But it has since been abundantly shown<sup>3</sup> that Hercher's conclusions were altogether too sweeping. Moreover, in this particular instance, the theory of manufactured information is rendered improbable by, at least, three things:

1. When Chennos gives bogus information he usually supports it, after the manner of his kind, by definite, but purely imaginary, authorities. He gives no authority here.

2. Philostratos, evidently referring to the same story, adds a detail not found in Chennos.

<sup>1</sup> Compare note 5, p. 367.

<sup>2</sup> JJ., Suppl. I, p. 269-293.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Müller, *Geog. Graeci Min.* II, p. LVII.

3. The testimony of both Philostratos and Chennos is to the effect that in the first and second century, at least, the superstition of the *δρακοντίτης* was closely associated with this particular story. Such being the case a passage from Pliny also tends not only to show that the statement of Chennos-Philostratos goes back to an earlier source, but, also, in a general way, what that source may have been.

In XXXVII 158, a passage on jewels which begins by quoting Zoroaster,<sup>1</sup> Pliny mentions various names for the dragon-stone. This implies that he may have looked up the subject in more than one authority. He then adds a brief description of how dragon-stones are procured, which shows something very like a community of source with Philostratos, l. c. All this suggests that, although he does not happen to mention it, Pliny, who is somewhat earlier than Chennos, must have been acquainted with that version of the Gyges story in which the dragon-stone played such an important part.

If Pliny is to be reckoned with here, the source of Chennos-Philostratos is even more likely to have been some of the Alexandrian paradoxographi who preserved the reference to Gyges among those passages on the magic and curative qualities of precious stones so characteristic of the age. If so, the ultimate source can hardly be other than the old story of Gyges itself. To a similar source and in a passage on rings might be traced that reference of Pliny to Midas's ring of invisibility which I have already mentioned.

It will be seen that the chief importance of investigating the sources of Chennos here was simply to show how his statement regarding the door scene may have gone back to the old story. That it actually did go back to the old story or that the old story contained practically the same thing was already acknowledged.

If, however, as seems likely, Pliny did know the story to which Chennos refers, his testimony also has some negative value for another purpose. Chennos gave Nysia both a double pupil and a dragon-stone. Either confers upon its possessor exactly the same powers as the other. This habit of doubling marvels, as I have already said, is characteristic of his class. One of the two is a later addition to the story. Now, Pliny is our principal authority for the double pupil. He appears to have collected all the references to it which he could find. But he does not

<sup>1</sup> See the article on Damigeron in Pauly-Wissowa.

mention Nysia's double pupil. The omission suggests that he did not know the book of Chennos because it was not yet in existence, and that Nysia's double pupil was not mentioned except by Chennos. In other words, Nysia's double pupil is likely to have been the invention of Chennos himself. If so, the charm which she used in the old story was the dragon-stone.

Before finally leaving this passage of Chennos it will be necessary to consider, briefly, a quotation from Joannes Tzetzes, Chiliades, I 3. This passage consists of twenty-nine political verses, *περὶ τοῦ Γύγου*. Tzetzes tells the story of Plato, then the story of Herodotos, and closes as follows :

Ἄλλ' ἤδη σε σφαδάζοντα καὶ κεχηνότα βλέπω,  
 Τὴν Γύγου χρήζοντα μαθεῖν πᾶσαν ἀλληγορίαν.  
 Ποιμὴν ὁ Γύγης λέγεται τῷ στρατηγὸς τυγχάνειν  
 Ἴππος χαλκοῦς ἀγέρωχός ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία,  
 Ναὶ μὴν καὶ τὰ ἀνάκτορα νεκρός, γυνὴ Κανδαύλου,  
 Τῶν ἀνακτόρων ἀπρακτὸς ἔνδοθεν καθημένη.  
 Ἦς τὸν δακτύλιον λαβὼν ὑπασπισταῖς δεικνύει,  
 Καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀπέκτεινε λαθραίως τὸν Κανδαύλην.  
 Στρέψας δὲ τὸν δακτύλιον πάλιν πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα  
 Γίνεται πᾶσιν ἐμφανής, λαβὼν τὴν βασιλείαν.

A. von Gutschmid<sup>1</sup> combines this with the version of Iustinus and the reference in Chennos, and concludes that all go back to a popular story of Gyges, which he reconstructs as follows :

Kandaules zeigt dem Gyges sein nacktes Weib, sie aber sieht ihn *durch* die Thür mit Hilfe eines Zauberringes den sie ans Finger trägt, ruft ihn zu sich und übergibt ihm ihren Ring der *nach innen gedreht unsichtbar macht*, mit der Aufforderung den Kandaules zu tödten. Ungesehen führt er Mörder in Kandaules' Gemach, zeigt sich nach dessen Ermordung, indem er den Ring nach aussen dreht, wieder dem Volke und wird König.<sup>2</sup>

Granting for the moment that Tzetzes reflects any version of the popular story, Gutschmid's reconstruction is, in itself, open to objection.

1. Chennos does not say that the queen saw Gyges "durch die Thür," but that she saw him *ἐξίόντα διὰ τῶν θυρῶν*—as he went out of the chamber.

2. Moreover, if it was the queen herself who gave Gyges the ring of darkness, the story of Plato, undeniably a portion of the

<sup>1</sup> L. c. V, p. 53.

<sup>2</sup> The italics are mine.

old popular tale, must drop out altogether. This is not to be believed. In that case, too, the *δρακοντίτης* is identified with the ring of Gyges, and, therefore, has the power of making its possessor invisible. But the *δρακοντίτης* does not make its possessor invisible. On the contrary, as we have already seen, it makes visible to its possessor that which is invisible to less favored mortals. This idea runs through the folk-lore of all nations.

3. But Gutschmid's reconstruction is also quite upset by the passage from Philostratos which he does not mention and appears to have missed. This reference, as we have already seen, makes it clear that in the story to which Chennos referred the queen used her dragon-stone as a counter-charm to the ring of Gyges, and was thus enabled to see him *ἐξιώντα διὰ τῶν θυρῶν*.

The note of Tzetzes shows that he may have had some distant knowledge of the story told by Chennos. But his *ἀλληγορία*, upon which Gutschmid founds so much of his reconstruction, so far from containing any hint of a popular story of Gyges, is nothing more than an attempt to harmonize and explain the versions of Plato and Herodotos. It is accomplished by a peculiar species of rationalization eminently characteristic of Tzetzes and his period. This type of *ἀλληγορία* seems to have given the utmost comfort to those who used it, and was much admired by our forefathers. Here, however, Tzetzes has seasoned his *ἀλληγορία* of Plato and Herodotos with a touch of that Euhemerism which makes Palaiphatos, de Incredibilibus, one of the dreariest books ever written. We may, therefore, dismiss the *ἀλληγορία* of Tzetzes and, with it, the reconstruction of Gutschmid, as of no value in this investigation. Gyges was put behind the door by Kandaules. He depended upon his ring to escape unobserved, but was detected by Nysia's counter-charm, the *δρακοντίτης*. This was a detail of the old story, and is vouched for by the combined testimony of Chennos and Philostratos.

One last item of somewhat doubtful testimony remains to be considered before closing our case. This is the (popular?) proverb, *Γύγου δακτύλιος*.

Several articles or notices in various old lexicographers and collectors of proverbs<sup>1</sup> explain this phrase. I select the one

<sup>1</sup> Diogenianos, III 99 (I, p. 232, Leutsch); Gregory of Kypros, II 5 (id., I, 358); II 58 (II 106); Makarios, III 9 (II 154); Apostolios, V 71 (II, p. 353); XV 85 (II, p. 649); Diogenianos II 20 (II, p. 20); Suidas, s. v. *Γύγου δακτύλιος* (also in Schott's *Proverbia Graecorum*, Plantin, 1612, p. 395); Eudokia,

who, if not the source of all the rest, appears to represent the oldest and best tradition. Γύγου δακτύλιος, says Diogenianos,<sup>1</sup> is used ἐπὶ τῶν πολυμηχάνων καὶ πανούργων, of cunning and resourceful people:

“When Gyges was a shepherd, the earth split open and he found a corpse wearing a ring. He put the ring on, and when he discovered that by turning the setting he could be visible or not, as he pleased, he slew the king by means of it and reigned in his stead.”

This explanation is repeated with some minor variations and differing degrees of completeness by the other authorities whom I have mentioned in note 1, p. 374. It appears to have been drawn from Plato, and some state the inference, if not the fact, in so many words.

It will be seen, at once, that for the purposes of our investigation the value of this proverb depends entirely upon its age and pedigree—in this case extremely difficult, if not impossible, to determine with certainty. Diogenianos, himself, belonged to the second century, and portions of the *Paroemiographi* go back to the collections of the Alexandrian Age. But our existing corpus has been very much affected by various editions and additions. In this instance, the difficulty is increased by the fact that Γύγου δακτύλιος, as a proverb, is not once found in the elder literature. Indeed, for my own part, I cannot find it anywhere except in the lexical sources already mentioned. Commentators on the *Paroemiographi* (cf. Leutsch, e. g., on Diogenianos, l. c.) state that this proverb is often quoted by the late writers, but the assertion is not borne out by any of the examples which they cite. The earliest, are from Libanios and Gregory of Nazianzus. In none of them may a knowledge or use of the proverb be assumed. They appear to be no more than the usual literary reference to the story of Plato characteristic of the second and fourth centuries A. D., and principally due to the use of this passage in the schools for various

---

*Violarium*, 99 (p. 169, Flach); on this work once attributed to Eudokia Makrembolitissa but now known to be a compilation of the 16th century, see Krumbacher, l. c., par. 240 (p. 578).

Schott, l. c., p. 395, refers to the epistles of Tzetzes, and Leutsch, to a passage from Theodoros Prodromos in Boissonade's *Anecdota Graeca*, II, p. 458. I regret that neither of these works is available to me: another case occurs in Zonaras, 456.

<sup>1</sup> III 99, vol. I, p. 232, Leutsch.



educational purposes. None of them is based on a proverb *ῥύγου δακτύλιος*. If there was ever any connection at all, the process must be reversed. In other words, the proverb *ῥύγου δακτύλιος* may be a late addition to the corpus, drawn from just such examples as those in Gregory and Libanios and supported or suggested as a proverbial phrase by the familiar use in the school of Plato's version of the old story. Strictly speaking, therefore, it would never have been a proverb at all, and we thus have an explanation of its absence from earlier literature. If this was the origin of the phrase, it has no value for us in this investigation.

On the other hand, a much earlier pedigree for the proverb and a different history of it are by no means impossible. Strictly speaking, the abstract from Plato which Diogenianos gives to explain his proverb really does not explain it very clearly. The reason may be because this was not the story from which the proverb was derived. If so, the situation could be explained by supposing that the proverb first appeared in one of the early Alexandrian collections. At that time the old story was still generally known. The definition, *ἐπὶ τῶν πολυμηχάνων καὶ πανούργων*, which we still find in all the lexical articles, was therefore quite sufficient. In that case, the abstract of Plato's version—often omitted from our lexical articles—should appear only after the real source of the proverb, that is to say, the old story of Gyges, had been forgotten. If, then, the abstract of Plato's version which I have quoted was added by Diogenianos himself we should thus have a further confirmation of our suspicion that, by the time of Chennos and Philostratos, the memory of our story had practically faded out. The phrase itself, however, may have still survived in common use. Many a proverbial expression goes back to a story long since forgotten.<sup>1</sup> It is true that it never appears in the literature, but this may be merely a matter of chance.

But, at all events, whether the proverb is a survival of our old story or not, it is certainly more in harmony with it than with any other version which we have considered. Every incident of the that story as it has unfolded before us has made this more and more evident. The proverb, in short, reflects the traditional character of Gyges himself and the popular conception of his character in the days of Herodotos and Plato was derived from his

<sup>1</sup> See, in particular, the interesting and suggestive article by Crusius, *Märchenreminiscenzen im antiken Sprichwort*, *Verhandlungen der XL. Philologenversammlung*, 1890, p. 31-47.

adventures in the popular story. The adventures of Gyges with his ring were, naturally, the main interest of it. We have already discovered the most important ones. That there were others is beyond any reasonable doubt. The gap, so to speak, between the version of Plato and that of Herodotos is not yet accounted for. The ring was probably connected with some adventure in Sardis which first commended Gyges to the king's notice.

But, above all, a statement of Xanthos is of especial significance here. Xanthos, it will be remembered, says that Gyges, to begin with, was in high favor, but that, afterwards, the king became suspicious, and, with a view to getting rid of him, set him at various difficult tasks. Gyges, however, performed them all successfully and was finally reinstated in the king's favor. Is any reader of fairy tales inclined to doubt that, in this passage, Xanthos is probably drawing from the old popular legend of Gyges? The motif not only has a peculiar fitness here, but is common to the folk-lore of all nations. The hero finds his life contingent on the successful performance of certain extremely difficult and perilous tasks. They are usually three in number, and as a rule, the time in which they must be completed is absurdly inadequate. In character, too, they have a strong resemblance to those actually mentioned by Xanthos.<sup>1</sup> They are always performed successfully, usually with the aid of supernatural means, in this case, of course, by the ring of darkness. In most cases, the story then proceeds, to the fame and fortune of the hero as inevitably as to the ruin of the taskmaster.

So much for the details of our old legend so far as they may be discovered or guessed. But, before closing, we shall find it profitable to consider briefly the type of it as a whole.

The character of all the incidents as well as of all the actors as they have gradually been revealed, points to one conclusion. So far as type is concerned, the legend of how Gyges became king of Lydia is the story of the Adventurer, the Giant, and the Princess, or in more general terms, of Wit, its contrasted Opponent and Dupe, and its Reward. This lets in a flood of light upon a point which constituted one of the main differences between the various rationalizations which we have been considering. In fact, each rationalization represents and embodies the

<sup>1</sup> πόνους προστάτων χαλεπούς τε καὶ μεγάλους ἐπὶ τε κάπρους<sup>1</sup> καὶ ἄλλα θηρία στέλλων.

author's interpretation of that point. This point is the ethics of the situation as portrayed in the old story.

In this favorite combination of the fairy tale, the Adventurer, Giant and Princess, no one was ever known to sympathize with the Giant, though, certainly, he is born for trouble as the sparks fly upward. It is quite useless for him to appeal to the courts of Fairy Land. Like the corporate giants of to-day he cannot recover damages and cannot expect any sympathy from the jury. He is stupid and brutal and full of folly. The hero outwits him, the princess betrays him and both live happily ever after, on the fruits of their combined labors.<sup>1</sup> Allowing for a touch or two of that alteration in Herodotos and Iustinus which we have already traced to diverging processes of rationalization, and will it be denied that Kandaules of the old story might well sit for the portrait of the Giant?

Not only the character of Kandaules but his situation is the same. The possession of the Princess—usually a sorceress, as in this story—is the one real condition of his life and power. The kingdom is within her gift as a matter of course. This is an unwritten law of Fairy Land which no one would dream of questioning. The difficulty with this condition does not begin until we transfer it to history, as Herodotos appears to have done, when he made the queen offer herself and the kingdom to Gyges in their memorable interview. A passage in the *Progymnasmata* of Nikolaos the Sophist (I, p. 288, W) shows that the difficulty in this statement was recognized by the ancient critics and much discussed by them. Modern commentators have usually seen in this detail of the Herodotean narrative the actual remains of a matriarchate in Lydia or, at all events of a theory to that effect held by the Greeks, and reflected, for example, in the legend of Herakles and Omphale.<sup>2</sup> But it would be more than dangerous

<sup>1</sup> A most excellent parallel, not only to the story of Gyges itself in a general way, but also to the ethics of the situation in the popular version, is found in Straparola's *Piacevoli Notti*, Bologna, 1899, p. 237, f. (V, IV). The Cornuto in this tale is a striking example of the Giant-type. Like Kandaules himself, like Antonio in Fletcher's 'Coxcomb', or in its original, the *Curioso Impertinente* of Cervantes, he is true to a rule which, so far as any popular story is concerned, holds good for every other Cornuto. He never gets any sympathy.

<sup>2</sup> See the examples collected by Gelzer, *Rhein. Mus.* XXXV 516, f. and Radet, l. c. p. 121. Radet, in common with many others, suggests that the Lydians actually did attach importance to the transmission of royal authority in the female line and that the fact points to the existence of a primitive matriarchate.

for the theory of a Lydian matriarchate to lean too heavily on the statement of Herodotos that the queen gave the kingdom to Gyges. The ease and naturalness of this statement in the old story on the one hand, and the difficulty of it in Herodotos on the other, are sufficiently indicative of its probable source and character.

The Adventurer in this combination may be a mere *filius terrae* and thus illustrate the favorite motif of lowliness raised to power, or, he may be one who slays the Giant as an act of vengeance for wrongs committed by him and thus comes into his own again. In the case of Gyges the former is suggested by Plato's abstract, the latter, by the actual history of his family as related by Xanthos, a popular tradition of which is by no means incompatible with Plato's abstract.

The Adventurer, like all successful adventurers, is usually remarkable for his address, versatility and quickness of wit. His career is based upon the not over scrupulous use of these qualities and constitutes the real savor and lasting popularity of the story. That, in these respects, the legendary Gyges was a dignified prototype of Jack the Giant-killer and something very like a replica of Odysseus has become more and more evident as each detail of the popular story has come to light. True to the old proverb he is *πολυμήχανος καὶ πανούργος*, a *Fortunatus*, as befits the favorite of Hermes,<sup>1</sup> born to strength and beauty and the love of women, as befits the favorite of Aphrodite.<sup>2</sup>

But recent investigation of the Herakles-Omphale legend, its sources and character, shows the danger of assuming that there really was any Lydian law of succession pointing to the existence of an ancient matriarchate. See E. Meyer, *Forschungen*, I 167; Cauer, *Rhein. Mus.*, XLVI 244; K. Tümpel, *Philol. L* 607; O. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, Munich, 1902, p. 495, f.

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Iliad*, 20, 395; *Autolykos*, in the *Odyssey*, 19, 395, f., etc., etc. See, also, Roscher, *Hermes der Windgott*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1894.

The favorite of Hermes, of course, reflects the character and temperament of Hermes. But the story itself shows that Gyges must have been conceived up as the favorite of Hermes. Hermes is the god of blind luck. The highest cast of the dice, *Ἑρμοῦ κλῆρος*, was named for him. Unexpected fortune, treasure-trove (Grimm, *D. M.*, p. 926, f., etc.) and the like are directly due to him. Compare the part played by him in the old fairy tale told by Phaedrus, *Append. III* (Riese). On the whole subject see Roscher, *l. c.*, p. 82, f. and *Lexikon*, I 2379, f. Magic rings are distinctly mentioned as the gift of Hermes by Lukian, *Navig.* 42, f.

Gyges may win the confidence of Kandaules and become his trusted adviser but there is no friendship with the Giant-type. Kandaules lays bare the secret of his life and fortune. From that moment he is merely a pawn in the game. Gyges, the Odysseus, and Nysia, the Kirke, of this story are now the principal characters. The scenes which follow—again suggestive, somehow, of the encounter of Odysseus and Kirke—really constitute a duel of wits between these Arcades ambo. Gyges had already done much to justify the favor of Hermes—if not of Aphrodite. But in the door episode he tried his disappearing trick once too often. Without knowing it he now has to deal with a rival magician. His charm is met and detected by the counter-charm of Nysia. In the love scenes which follow Gyges is far from telling all he knows—and so is Nysia. He says nothing of his ring or of the door incident—neither does she, until the time is ripe. Then she sends for him, plays the trump she has been keeping in reserve and takes the trick. Indeed, Nysia has scored every point which she undertook to make in this game. But in this realm of Oberon, Gyges the child of Fortune, is defeated only when defeat is the condition of his ultimate success.

My reconstruction of this old story is now as complete as I can

---

In fact, the whole story of Gyges, his character, the discovery of his ring, the power of disappearing at will which it conferred upon him, his wealth, his unvarying good luck; all point to the favor of Hermes. Indeed, Kandaules, the name of Gyges' mortal patron in Herodotos and Iustinus, and, presumably, in the popular story (Sadyattes in Xanthos) was, also a Lydian name of Hermes (as well as of Herakles). Cf. Höper in Roscher's *Lexikon*, s. v. Kandaulas. The parallel is suggestive to one attempting to trace the origin and genetic development of the old popular story before it reached the stage with which my investigation is exclusively concerned.

<sup>2</sup> The favor of Aphrodite is not as clearly suggested. Beauty and charm, however, are the gifts of Aphrodite. Compare the legends of Paris, Kinyras, Aineias, Phaon, etc. These qualities are expressly given to Gyges by Damaskenos-Xanthos and that the same was true of the popular tradition appears to be suggested by the fact that Horace, for example, gives the name of Gyges to the hero of Odes III 7 (cf. II 5, 20), in both cases, a person evidently distinguished for those qualities. The prominence of the erotic motif in the old story of Gyges also points in the same direction and is, to some extent, supported by certain scraps of legend regarding him which have reached us from other quarters, perhaps originally due to the same association of ideas. Compare Müller, *FHG.* IV 171, 47; II 314, 34.

make it. The task involves many complications and difficulties. Moreover, while some points will perhaps be acknowledged at first sight others rest on a chain of probabilities incapable of final and irrefragable proof. I have aimed, however, in every case, to state the point in such a way that the reader may easily form an opinion of its value.

The article has been long and the course of it has been frequently interrupted by the discussion of many minor, but necessary details. It will, therefore, not be out of place to close it with a brief survey of results.

Gyges first of the Lydian Mermnadai rose to the throne in the seventh century B. C. His complex character, his commanding personality, his long and adventurous career, all united to make him a popular hero. He was also the first great barbarian with whom the Greeks had come in contact. It is evident that at an early date a mass of tradition had gathered about him. Some of it was no doubt of Lydian origin, though the Lydian element can no longer be traced. The most of it, however, was due to the rich fancy of the Ionian Greeks. It is probable that much with regard to him might have been gleaned from the old lyric poets, especially Archilochos and Mimnermos.

How far the tradition of Gyges which has reached us was affected by Kroisos it is impossible to determine. Perhaps to a considerable extent. Kroisos, last of the Mermnadai, was the Grand Monarque of his house. Hellenic court poets must have vied with each other in running back his pedigree and glorifying the achievements of his ancestors. Much of the Lydian legend of Herakles and Omphale has been ascribed to the efforts of these poets.<sup>1</sup> At such a time the old traditions of Gyges must have revived. For was he not, as Plato himself calls him, 'ancestor of the Lydian'?<sup>2</sup> No doubt, also, these traditions were not only revived, but also revised and enlarged. The temple tradition of Delphi should also be mentioned. It was lively and favorable, for the best of reasons. One or more unknown logographers may perhaps be assumed among pre-Herodotean authorities. Xanthos is credited with the use of native Lydian sources.

But of all the traditions regarding Gyges the most notable and

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, end, p. 378.

<sup>2</sup> It is not impossible that in this very phrase we have a trace of the fact that the popular story which Plato and Herodotos knew actually did assume final form in the time of Kroisos. See p. 387, note.

dramatic was that which told how he became the king of Lydia. No less than five different versions of this event have reached us. The first is from Herodotos. The second goes back to the *Lydiaka* of Xanthos, though it is known to us only in an excerpt from Nikolaos Damaskenos which was made by Constantinus Porphyrogenetos in the tenth century. The third is from Plato. The fourth is partially (?) reported by Plutarch; his source is unknown. The fifth comes to us from Pompeius Trogus through a rhetorical abstract by Iustinus; the ultimate source appears to have been some historian of the Alexandrian Age.

There was, however, still another and far older version than any of these, though its age and ultimate source cannot be determined precisely. This was a genuine popular legend, a fairy-tale, describing the career of Gyges on his way to the throne. It probably originated among the Ionians and Lydians not far from the period of its hero. It was doubtless comparatively simple at the beginning and grew as time went on. At all events, in the days of Herodotos and Plato it was a fully developed tale of the Graeco-Oriental type with a dramatic plot and a number of adventures. The actual persistence of it in the popular tradition after Plato's time cannot be proved. The latest reference to it comes from Philostratos at the beginning of the third century, A. D. At that time, apparently, it had long been dead. I find no certain trace of it in the legends of modern Greece or Asia Minor. The whole of it as a popular story was probably never committed to writing, and can only be recovered from the consideration of a few scattered references and the various literary versions.

An abstract of the first half is given by Plato to illustrate a point in a philosophical discussion. The omissions and abbreviations are such as were dictated by the purpose for which it was intended. A single sentence at the end, brief, but very valuable, gives a general outline of the remainder. The second half lies behind the rationalization of Herodotos and emerges as soon as we study Herodotos in connection with the last sentence of Plato, the version of Iustinus and the references of Chennos and Philostratos. As each detail comes to light it becomes clear that the version of Herodotos was drawn directly from the popular story, and, apparently, from nothing else. Not only that, but Herodotos handled the old tale with the utmost conservatism. He removed the element of marvel as a matter of course. This is why we hear nothing of the half which Plato related. The removal

of charm and counter-charm in the door scene was easy. The equation, so to speak, was still undisturbed. The removal of the ring from the murder was still easier, moreover, it was now demanded, in order to preserve that parallelism between the murder scene and the door scene which was characteristic of the old story.

For various reasons, among them his own good taste and the Delphian tradition of Gyges, Herodotos deleted the love affair. His method was simple and conservative. The removal of the ring still left some visits to the queen after the door episode. Herodotos put them before it and changed the motive for them. The resulting gap was then filled by moving up the interview to the next morning after the door scene. Thus, the great event of the story, the queen's revenge, could remain undisturbed. The queen's offer of herself and the kingdom is a feature of the old fairy-tale. This, and not a primitive Lydian matriarchate, is the explanation of an action inconsistent with the ordinary laws of royal succession.

The gap between Plato and Herodotos should also be considered. There was an adventure here with the ring which introduced Gyges to Kandaules, though this is not vouched for by any antique authority. His confidence was finally gained by Gyges through the performance of several difficult tasks with the aid of the ring. For this detail Xanthos gives us the clue.

Gyges was conceived of as the favorite of Hermes and Aphrodite. The tradition of his beauty, strength and address, his versatility, cunning and energy, in short, of his likeness to Odysseus, goes back to the old popular story. The queen in that story had much in common with Kirke. For the sake of greater clearness I append here a brief outline of my attempted reconstruction. The type is that of the Adventurer, Giant and Princess.

Gyges [the son of Daskylos and] the ancestor of Kroisos was a shepherd when he was young, in the service of [Kandaules] king of Lydia. Once upon a time there was a storm and an earthquake so violent that the ground split open near the place where Gyges was watching his flocks. Gyges was amazed at the sight and finally went down into the cleft. The story tells of many wonderful things which he saw there (these details are lost).

[They were also seen by the other shepherds of Lydia? (Philos.)]

Among these wonderful things was a brazen horse which was hollow and had doors. In it was nothing but a corpse, of heroic size, and on one of its fingers a gold ring.

[The corpse—or the ring—was that of Midas? (Pliny)].



Gyges took the ring and came out again.

Sometime later he attended the monthly assembly of the shepherds and while there accidentally discovered the qualities of his ring, as described by Plato. He then procured his appointment as one of the messengers to the king and went up to Sardis to seek his fortune.

After reaching Sardis an adventure with the ring brought him to the notice of Kandaules (?). At first, he was highly favored but later the king, who was cruel and whimsical, became suspicious of Gyges and set him at several tasks certain, as he supposed, to compass his destruction. Gyges, however, performed them all successfully with the aid of his ring, was reinstated in favor and given great estates (Xanthos, who, himself, gives an idea of these tasks).

[Further adventures (amatory and otherwise) with his ring?].

Gyges was now not only rich and powerful but also admired and feared for his beauty, strength and address, and for his versatility and superhuman knowledge of what was going on. The king who, like everyone else, knew nothing of his ring (?), found Gyges invaluable, gave him the post of chief adviser and consulted him on all occasions.

There was one thing, however, which Kandaules had always kept jealously guarded, because it was the principal source, the real secret, of his power. This was his wife. She was [a Mysian princess and] exceedingly beautiful. But what made her indispensable to Kandaules was the fact that she was also very wise and powerful, being a mighty sorceress.

The one vulnerable spot in Kandaules was his passion for his wife. Like all who had ever seen her he was utterly bewitched by her beauty and as his confidence in Gyges increased he began to talk of it more and more freely. At last he insisted upon showing her. [Gyges refused, foreseeing mortal peril to himself from either, or both. But at last he was forced to comply and] the programme devised by Kandaules was carried out as related by Herodotos.

Gyges gazed upon her. She was more lovely even than Kandaules had described her, and Gyges fell in love with her then and there. Finally, having turned his ring around to make himself invisible, Gyges left the room.

The queen, however, [possessed a dragon-stone. Either when she first came into the room or] as he was going out [of it she] had seen Gyges [in spite of his magic ring]. But she made no sign. She knew that the situation was due to Kandaules and swore to be avenged. When, therefore, Gyges, perhaps at her own instigation, came to her and declared his passion, revenge and, possibly, other considerations, prompted her to yield. Gyges was able to visit her unobserved on account of his magic ring and the intrigue went on for some time, [nothing being said on either side regarding the door episode.]

At last, when the queen saw that Gyges was entirely in her power, and being also in love with him herself, she laid her plans and sent for him. When he arrived, she told him [for the first time—as in Herodotos—that she had seen him passing out of the chamber, and why,] that now Gyges must slay Kandaules or else die himself. Whatever the feelings of Gyges may have been, his situation, despite his magic ring, was even more desperate than in Herodotos. He had a sorceress to deal with and was committed to her by ties which he could not break, even if he had so desired.

Gyges acceded, the destruction of Kandaules was planned and carried out

by the two as described by Herodotos, and with the aid of the magic ring as hinted by Plato.

When the deed was accomplished she gave Gyges the kingdom, as she had promised. He made her his queen [and they lived happily ever after.]

Such is the tale of Gyges, ancestor of Kroisos the Lydian and the founder of the house of the Mermnadai.

It will be seen that the most of this story comes from Plato and Herodotos. Other versions and references have contributed something, but their principal use has been to show how and why this is the case. They have also shed important light upon the ethics of the old story.

As containing a record of the genuine history of Gyges, Plutarch and Herodotos have each had their day. Just at present Xanthos is in the ascendant. My investigation was not concerned with this point and yet, indirectly, it has borne upon it to a certain extent. Plutarch's account may be safely dropped as only partial and a mere aetiological myth at that. Plato, Herodotos and Iustinus reduce to one source, the old popular tale. All we have to consider, then, is the popular tale and Xanthos. Now even those who make the most of Xanthos as an historical authority, of course, recognize that he contains folk elements. I am inclined to believe that he contains little else. If this is the case, practically all the Greeks knew of Gyges, at all events, of this portion of his career, rested on folk-tradition. But for that reason to reject the truth of it in toto, would be more than unsafe. It must not be forgotten that Gyges, though a hero of the popular fancy, is also the Gu-gu of the Assyrian inscription and unmistakably a great historical personage; further, that, with due allowance for certain characteristic developments and additions, the traditions of such a man are by no means untrue simply because they are popular. Indeed, the general similarity between Xanthos and the popular story is suggestive of something approaching a common source. It is for the biographer of Gyges to decide how far this community of traditions regarding him is due to the fact that the ultimate source of them is the actual historical truth.

The different rationalizations of our story were largely influenced by the conception each author had or wished to convey of the ethics of the situation. It is interesting to see how entirely different are the characters of the three personages in the old tale, in Herodotos and in Iustinus, and yet how slight, withal, are the changes which made them so.

The most powerful reagent was the fact that Gyges, Kandaules, and the queen were taken out of the free air of Fairy Land and subjected to the laws of ordinary humanity. They were all lifted and ennobled by the surpassing genius of Herodotos. They were all debased by the rhetorical bias of Iustinus.

In the old tale, the hero and heroine slew the brutal and foolish king between them and lived happily ever after. The touch of unreality about them and their deeds is due to the atmospheric effects of Fairy Land and exonerates them from mere human responsibility. Perhaps this is why, in considering the best illustrations for this version, one reverts so readily to the old vase-paintings. The people in these paintings are not subject to the common law or the moral code. Be it a funeral or a feast, an action deserving a vote of thanks or a gibbet, they go about it with the same archaic smile.

Iustinus gives us the sermon of a popular phrase-maker based on the details of a sensational scandal in high life as reported by one of our "great dailies," near enough to the original to escape a suit for libel, vulgar enough to please the average morning reader. The archives of several well-known journals contain appropriate illustrations.

With Herodotos the old tale of Gyges emerges as a great tragedy of Destiny, a parallel, in prose, to the Agamemnon and the Oidipus Tyrannos. All the characters are worthy of the situation. No one can blame Kandaules for a madness which the gods have sent upon him and which drives him to his doom—*χρὴν γὰρ Κανδαύλῃ γενέσθαι κακῶς*—as inexorably as it raises Gyges to his high estate, each in his own despite. So, too, the irresponsible sorceress of the old fairy tale, the vulgar assassin in Iustinus, becomes the evil genius of Kandaules. She vindicates her outraged womanhood and, law or no law, who shall deny the justice of her claim to remain the queen of Lydia with whatsoever mate she shall choose? But despite the simplicity and directness of the antique emotions it is a question whether this couple could "live happily ever after." Gyges undertakes his long task of royal power a sadder man and with no illusions. Nevertheless, there is room in his life for only one woman and he cannot doubt her.

If the results of this article are justified by the testimony presented, they are worth consideration merely for the light which they throw upon the methods of Herodotos himself.

One hardly knows which to esteem the more remarkable, his genius or his conservatism. The old tale of Gyges the Lydian was all but unchanged by him, yet under the spell of his surpassing art it rose once and for all to the beauty and dignity of a masterpiece. It is quite likely that its historical truth may be questioned. But for the most of us its historical truth is a matter of no serious concern. It is quite enough that the truth of it as a human document is immortal.<sup>1</sup>

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

<sup>1</sup> I have already stated my belief (p. 381 and n. 2) that the popular story as Herodotos and Plato knew it must have assumed final form in the time of Kroisos or as a result of contact with the Delphian tradition. It would be obviously then, if ever, that the folly of Kandaules, if not originally a part of the story, would be combined with the more ancient and simple tale of the ring. Moreover, the period as well as the source are against the supposition that the combination would have been effected by deleting the element of marvel. The point is, of course, important.

I ought to add that 'behind the open door' (p. 276, l. 14) is really not a correct translation of the Herodotean *ἔπισθε τῆς ἀνοικόμενης θύρης*. The door must be supposed to open *into* the room. The present participle adds a detail to the plot. It implies that Gyges must previously take such a position that the door, *as it opens*, shall swing back and conceal him.